

REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-36 are pending. Claims 8, 9, 11, 12-14, 16-25, and 27-34 are amended and new claims 35 and 36 are added. No claims are cancelled. Unless otherwise indicated below, the amendments are made for purposes of consistency, rather than to distinguish the claims from the references relied upon by the Examiner. In view of the foregoing Amendments and the following Remarks, allowance of the pending claims is requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 4-5, 9-13, 15-16, 20-24, 26-27, and 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,771,288 to Boulter ("Boulter"), in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030065814 to Ishii ("Ishii"). Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, and 11 for at least the reason that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. The Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for at least the reason that Boulter and Ishii, even if properly combined, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 1.

For example, claim 1 recites: "*receiving through the interactive display updates to at least one propagation status of at least one of the bridging ports of at least one of the switches...*" In the Office Action at pg. 2, the Examiner alleges that this feature of claim 1 is taught by Boulter col. 8, ll. 53-58. However, the portion of Boulter relied upon by the Examiner reads: "[a] change in the status of the network device 104 is reflected by a change in a corresponding mimic sub-image 302 during the next update of sub-images 302. Other device states of the monitored network device 104 may also be interactively controlled via management system 102." This portion of Boulter does not relate to receiving updates to propagation status for bridging ports through an interactive display.

At best, Boulter relates to updating a network device mimic by updating indicators regarding individual network devices, rather than updating the entire mimic. See Boulter col. 4, ll. 13-15; col. 8, ll. 35-36; and col. 9, ll. 1-5. Boulter does not deal

with updating propagation status via an interactive display. For example, the update of network indicators in Boulter relate to a detected change in a monitored network element, but does not receive its updates “through [an] interactive display,” as recited in the claimed invention. See Boulter col. 9, ll. 19-23. Assuming *arguendo* that updates do occur through an interactive display, any mention of status in Boulter does not relate to bridge port propagation status. See. Boulter col. 8, ll. 38-44 (describing control of “port status” as control of whether a port is enabled or disabled); col. 8, ll. 1-7 (“[device state information] indicates whether a link is connected to the corresponding port.”); or col. 9, ll. 19-23 (“[d]etected changes in status...of a monitored device, for example, if an active port becomes inactive or if a new link is connected to a port...”).

The Examiner’s citations to Ishii do not cure these deficiencies. Thus, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 1 for at least the reason that the references relied upon by the Examiner fail to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. As such, the rejection thereto must be withdrawn. Furthermore, dependent claims 2, 4-5, and 9-11 are patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner because they depend from and add features to an allowable independent claim.

Regarding independent claims 12, 23 and 34, Applicants traverse the Examiner’s rejections of these claims because the references relied upon by the Examiner fail to teach or suggest all of the features of these claims. However, solely to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended claims 12, 23, and 34 to clarify distinctions over the references relied upon by the Examiner.

For example, amended claim 12 recites: “*the software operable to...retrieve information associated with a plurality of switches...wherein the information associated with the plurality of switches includes at least identifiers of the bridge ports of each switch and propagation statuses of the bridge ports...wherein propagation status includes an indication of whether or not a bridge port should be polled to obtain its current status...*” Boulter, alone or in combination with Ishii, fails to teach propagation status that is an indication of whether or not a bridge port should be polled to obtain its current status.

For example, any mention of status in Boulter does not relate to bridge port propagation status. See. Boulter col. 8, ll. 38-44 (describing control of "port status" as control of whether a port is enabled or disabled); col. 8, ll. 1-7 ("[device state information] indicates whether a link is connected to the corresponding port."); or col. 9, ll. 19-23 ("[d]etected changes in status...of a monitored device, for example, if an active port becomes inactive or if a new link is connected to a port..."). For at least this reason, the features of amended claim 12 are not taught or suggested by the references relied upon by the Examiner. Independent claims 23 and 34 include similar features. Accordingly, allowance of these claims is proper. Dependent claims 13, 15-16, 20-22, 24, 26-27, and 31-33 each depend from and add features to one of claims 12 or 24. As such, allowance of these claims is proper because they depend from an allowable claim.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 3, 6-8, 14, 17-19, 25, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Boulter and Ishii, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,179 to Kekic et al. ("Kekic"). Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejection of these claims.

As stated above, the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of anticipation of claim 1 using Boulter and Ishii. The addition of Kekic does not cure the deficiencies of Boulter and Ishii discussed above. Claims 3, and 6-8 depend from and add features to claim 1. As such, claims 3, and 6-8 are allowable because they depend from an allowable claim.

Also as set forth above, claims 12, and 23 are allowable over the references relied upon by the Examiner. Claims 14, 17-19, 25, and 28-30 depend from and add features to one of claims 12 or 23. As such, claims 14, 17-19, 25, and 28-30 are allowable because they depend from an allowable claim.

New claims

Applicant has added new claims 35 and 36 which depend from and add features to one of claim 1 or claim 12. For the reasons set forth above regarding claim 1 and amended claim 12, new claims 35 and 36 are allowable because they depend from

allowable claims. As such, allowance of new claims 35 and 36 is proper.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: **February 21, 2006**

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Timothy C. Rooney
Registration No. 55,878

Customer No. 00909

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Main: 703-770-7900
Direct Dial: 703-770-7939
Fax: 703-770-7901